



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,466	06/23/2003	Gary A. Watkins	GP-303344 (2760/103)	7594
7590	11/06/2009		EXAMINER	
General Motors Corporation Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			FISHER, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE	
			11/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,466	WATKINS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PAUL R. FISHER	3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Arguments submitted on July 7, 2009 have been acknowledged. No amendments have been made. Claims 1-20, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. In claim 18, claim elements "means for associating" "means for maintaining" and "means for deactivating" are means (or step) plus function limitations that invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function. In the applicant's specification there is no clear link to what means are performing these various actions. Page 3, of the applicant's originally filed specification merely recite there is a means for performing these actions but no indication as to what this means is or what structure would be performing these actions.

Applicant is required to:

(a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

- (b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or
- (c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. (US 6,611,194) hereafter Vieweg, in view of Messina et al. (US 2002/0065037 A1) hereafter Messina.**

As per claims 1, 10 and 18, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently discloses computer readable media and a system for:

associating a vehicle telematics device with a vehicle telematics subscription service (Col. 3, lines 21 – 31; discloses that a service key is transmitted to the terminal to enable services such as traffic information, navigation etc. From this it can be seen

that the telematics device in this case the terminal is associated with a subscription or it is entitled to receive services from a service center);

maintaining subscription service data at the vehicle telematics device (Col. 4, lines 5-6; discloses that the service key stored on the terminal is interpreted to be subscription service data stored on the telematic device); and

deactivating (which is described as the following steps 1) placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device and 2) surrendering at least one identification number previously assigned to the vehicle telematics device. Deactivating is not drawn to the disabling of the device, but rather to the two steps listed above) the vehicle telematics device at the vehicle at the expiration of the subscription service based on the subscription service data (Col. 1, lines 48-52; discloses that new keys have to be inserted when the subscription period ends, from this the Examiner asserts that the original keys that would be used to activate the device have been surrendered since new keys are necessary in order to activate and use the device. It is also determined that the deactivating is based on subscription service data since the original keys that were used are no longer usable in the system).

wherein the deactivating step comprises placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 48 through col. 2, line 22; discloses that communications can be sent from the telematics device to the service center to make requests); and

surrendering at least one identification number previously assigned to the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 48-52; discloses that new keys have to be inserted when

the subscription period ends, from this the Examiner asserts that the original keys that would be used to activate the device have been surrendered since new keys are necessary in order to activate and use the device);

Vieweg does disclose placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device, however doesn't explicitly disclose that it is in relation to deactivating.

Messina, which talks about a telematics application for implementation in conjunction with a satellite broadcast delivery system, discloses the interface or device being used to send a request for deactivation (Page 1, paragraph [0005]; teaches that the interface along with the information sources and ground station allow the customer to perform various tasks such as initiate and/or cancel their subscription).

Therefore, from this teaching of Messina, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the managing of vehicle telematics device subscription service cycle as taught by Vieweg, with an interface capable of sending a cancellation request as taught by Messina, for the purpose of allowing the customer to initiate the cancellation of their service from their vehicle. By allowing this feature the customer is provided with more options and a greater sense of control over how they use and operate their device and subscription services.

As per claims 2 and 11, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: configuring an enrollment event trigger parameter in the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 48-52; disclose the use of service keys that may expire in the device and render the device inoperable, and hence require replacement with a

new service key, which discloses the configuring of an enrollment event trigger parameter in the vehicles telematics device).

As per claim 3, Vieweg discloses a method for: selecting an enrollment event trigger from expired months or specific date (Col.1, lines 31-33; disclose the use of service keys for service data that which is registered only for a period of time to expire in the terminal after some time has elapsed is interpreted to teach an enrollment event trigger selected from expired months and/or a specific date).

As per claims 4 and 12, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: determining an enrollment event based on the enrollment event trigger parameter (Col. 1, lines 48-52; discloses the insertion of new service keys, which may be necessary, for example, when a subscription period has expired for a particular service is interpreted to teach determining an enrollment event based on the enrollment event trigger parameter);

initiating an inbound communication from the vehicle telematics device responsive to a determination of an enrollment event (Col. 3, lines 57-59; disclose a request being made by the service center 3 or 4 in response to the terminal 2 sending a request is interpreted to teach the initiation of an inbound communication from the vehicle telematics device in response to a determination of an enrollment event);

receiving a configuration data communication (Col. 4, lines 31-36; discloses the service center transmitting the new service key to the terminal, and the use of the new service key by the terminal to decode encrypted service data is interpreted to teach the receiving of configuration data communication); and

configuring an activation event trigger parameter and a maintenance event trigger parameter based on the received configuration data (Col. 1, lines 31-33; discloses the desirability of allowing service keys registered only for a period of time and expire in the terminal after some time, or that it can be desirable for such service keys to be updated. The disclosure of service keys that require updating is interpreted to disclose a maintenance event trigger parameter).

Vieweg inherently discloses an activation event trigger parameter because once the service key is installed on the telematics device, the telematic device becomes activated since it is able to decode service data and is thereby operational from the viewpoint of a user.

As per claims 5 and 13, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: configuration data communication to include telematic device subscription service data, telematics device service provider data, telematics device authentication data and maintenance event data (Col. 4, lines 5-8; disclose that transmission of service key 9 from a service center 3 or 4 into a terminal 2). The terminal requires a valid service key in order to make use of the service data, therefore the service key is interpreted to include subscription service data, telematics service provider data, telematics device authentication data and as the service key may expire after some time and require updating or replacement, maintenance event data as well.

As per claims 6 and 14, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: activating the telematics device for operation with the subscription service (Col. 4, lines 5-9; discloses the sequence for coded insertion of a service key 9

(for service data) from a service center 3 or 4 into a terminal 2 start with terminal 2 requesting (in step 11) a service key from a service center 3 or 4). As the terminal requires a valid service key in order to make use of the service data, the insertion of the service key into the device is interpreted to teach the activation of the vehicle telematics device for operation with the subscription service.

As per claims 7 and 15, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: Determining an activation event based on the activation event trigger parameter (Col. 4, lines 5-9; discloses the sequence for coded insertion of a service key 9 (for service data) from a service center 3 or 4 into a terminal 2 state with terminal 2 requesting (in step 11) a service key from a service center 3 or 4). As the terminal requires a valid service key in order to make use of the service data, the insertion of the service key into the device is interpreted to teach the activation of the vehicle telematics device for operation with the subscription service and hence the determination of an activation event based on the trigger parameter is inherently disclosed.

initiating an inbound communication responsive to a determination of an activation event (Col. 4, lines 5-9; discloses that the sequence for coded insertion of a service key 9 (for service data) from a service center 3 or 4 into a terminal 2 starts with terminal 2 requesting (in step 11) a service key from a service center 3 or 4 (emphasis added)).

registering an authentication key (Col. 3, lines 53-57; discloses the terminal manufacturer 1 transmits 13 to the trust center 5 a terminal identity number 10 which

enables the trust center 5 to assign the decoding key 7 to a terminal identity and hence to a terminal (emphasis added)).

As per claims 8 and 16, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: determining a maintenance event based on the maintenance event trigger parameter (Col. 1, lines 49-51; discloses that new service keys may be necessary when a subscription period has expired for a particular service, thereby teaching determining a maintenance event (interpreted to be the necessity of new service keys) in response to a maintenance event trigger parameter (interpreted to be expiration of a subscription period for a particular service)).

initiating an inbound communication responsive to a determination of a maintenance event (Col. 4, lines 5-9; disclose the initiation of communication in response to an activation event when the terminal requests a new service key. Col. 1, lines 49-50; discloses that new service keys may be needed when a subscription period has expired). The disclosures of Vieweg are interpreted to teach the initiation of an inbound communication in response to the determination of a maintenance event.

receiving a maintenance data communication having an updated maintenance event trigger parameter (Col. 4, lines 31-38; discloses the transmittal of a new service key to terminal).

configuring an updated maintenance event trigger at the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 31-33; inherently disclose that as the service key may expire in the terminal after some time, and the terminal thereby requires an updated service key and

an updated maintenance event trigger is therefore configured when the updated service key is transmitted to the device).

As per claims 9 and 17, Vieweg discloses a method and inherently computer readable media for: deactivating the vehicle telematics device by disassociating the vehicle telematics device from the vehicle telematics device subscription service (Col. 1, lines 49-51; discloses that new service keys may be necessary when a subscription period has expired for a particular service). Vieweg thereby inherently teaches that when a service key has expired or is no longer valid, the vehicle telematics device is thereby disassociated from the telematics service.

As per claim 19, Vieweg discloses a method wherein the identification number comprises an ID assigned to the telematics unit during a previous activation of the telematics unit (Col. 1, lines 17-41).

7. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. (US 6,611,194) hereafter Vieweg, in view of Messina et al. (US 2002/0065037 A1) hereafter Messina as applied to claim 1, further in view of Ikeda (US 2002/0174360 A1) hereafter Ikeda.**

As per claim 20, the combination of Vieweg and Messina teaches the above-enclosed invention, but fails to explicitly disclose wherein the identification number comprises a cellular telephone number.

Ikeda, which talks about a service providing system, teaches wherein the identification number comprises a cellular telephone number (Page 8, paragraph [0135];

discloses that by making the ID or identification number of the device a telephone number it makes it easy for the application server or service center to access the wireless communication apparatus of the device).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ikeda, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the managing of vehicle telematics device subscription service cycle as taught by the combination of Vieweg and Messina, with the use of a telephone number as the identification number as shown in Ikeda, for the purpose of making it easy for the application server or service center to get in communication with the telematics device as shown in Ikeda.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
9. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Support for "means for associating" can be found in Applicants' application on page 12, lines 1-10 and 14-16' Figs. 2-3, Blocks 200, 251, and 310. Support for "means for maintaining" can be found in Applicants' application on page 10, lines 18-21; Fig. 2, Block 256. Support for "means for deactivating" can be found in Applicants' application on page 15, lines 23-28; Figs. 2-3, Blocks 200 and 330," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The recited passages in the applicant's specification fail to recite specific structure that is used to carry out the means functions. Further the applicant has stated that "In general, as is well known to those skilled in the art, the various means plus function elements are carried out via suitable programming of the hardware disclosed in the figures and described in the

specification to carry out the particular functions claimed. Suitable programming techniques and the needed hardware are known to those skilled in the art." However, merely referencing to a general purpose computer with appropriate programming with providing any detailed explanation of the appropriate programming, or simply reciting software without providing some detail about the means to accomplish the function, would not be an adequate disclosure of the corresponding structure to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, even when one of ordinary skill in the art is capable of writing the software to convert a general purpose computer to a special purpose computer to perform the claimed function. Therefore the rejections under 112 second paragraph have been maintained.

10. In response to the applicant's description of Messina, Messina is not directed to the lack of interaction, rather its purpose to create two-way communication from the telematics interface device. The figures used by the applicant are marked as prior art and do not limit the disclosure of the Messina reference. Rather figure 2 shows the various components of the disclosed invention which include a backchannel. Page 2, paragraph [0021] show there is two-way communication from the telematics interface device.

11. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "deactivation of the device itself") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057

(Fed. Cir. 1993). Deactivating, which is described as the following steps 1) placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device and 2) surrendering at least one identification number previously assigned to the vehicle telematics device. Deactivating is not drawn to the disabling of the device, but rather to the two steps listed above as set forth by the pending claims.

12. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Expiration of a service key would amount to deactivating the telematics device only if that device were not used for any other service, and even then might still not be an effective deactivation because, in cellular systems, for example, the telematics device would still be active with the cellular system, and thus still using resources....," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted above the claims require, "deactivating the vehicle telematics device at the vehicle at the expiration of the subscription service based on the subscription service data, wherein the deactivating step comprises placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device and surrendering at least one identification number previously assigned to the vehicle telematics device," thus as stated above the act of deactivating the device comprises placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 48 through col. 2, line 22; discloses that communications can be sent from the telematics device to the service center to make requests); and surrendering at least one identification number previously assigned to the vehicle telematics device (Col. 1, lines 48-52; discloses that new keys have to be inserted when the subscription period ends, from this the Examiner asserts that the original keys that would be used to activate the device have been surrendered since new keys are necessary in order to activate and

use the device). From this it is shown that Vieweg does in fact disclose the deactivating process as disclosed in the claims as currently written. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

13. In response to the applicant's argument that, "canceling a subscription does not equate to, nor necessarily involve, deactivating a telematics unit," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term deactivate is defined by <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deactivate> as to make inactive or ineffective. The term cancel is defined by <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cancel> as to destroy the force, effectiveness, or validity of: ANNUL <cancel a magazine subscription> <a canceled check>, ANNUL is further defined by <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/annul> as to make ineffective or inoperative. From this it is shown that both cancel and deactivate are equivalent terms. The Examiner asserts that the reference reads over the claims as currently written and the rejection is therefore maintained.

14. In response to the applicant's argument that, "the subscription service cancellation taught by Messina does not deactivate the radio or telematics unit of the vehicle," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated by the applicant, "it deactivates a customer's access to the satellite radio service," hence it makes the device ineffective, therefore deactivated. The claims do not require that the device not be used for other things as shown above it only requires that "deactivating the vehicle telematics device at the vehicle at the expiration of the subscription service based on the subscription service data, wherein the deactivating step comprises placing a communication from the vehicle telematics device and surrendering at least one identification number previously

assigned to the vehicle telematics device," as shown above these steps are shown by Vieweg. The Examiner asserts that the references when combined read over the claims as currently written, and thus the rejections are maintained.

15. In response to the applicant's argument that, "View/Messina do not Disclose or Suggest Deactivating by Placing a Communication From the Vehicle Telematics Device," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated by the applicant, "Vieweg teaches placing a communication," and Messina teaches that a communication can be used to cancel the subscription thus disable or deactivate the device. While Messina was not used to show the communication being sent from the telematics device, this feature is also shown in Messina as disclosed above Page 2, paragraph [0021] show there is two-way communication from the telematics interface device. Therefore when the references are combined they teaches the recited limitations, thus the rejection has been maintained.

16. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

17. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Vieweg/Messina do not Disclose or Suggest Deactivating by Surrendering at least one Previously Assigned Identification Number," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vieweg does disclose this feature, specifically Col. 1, lines 48-52; discloses that new keys have to be inserted when the

subscription period ends, from this the Examiner asserts that the original keys that would be used to activate the device have been surrendered since new keys are necessary in order to activate and use the device. From this the Examiner asserts that the reference read over the claims as currently written, and the rejection has therefore been maintained.

18. In response to the applicant's argument that "surrendering" implies that the identification number is relinquished for re-use," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term "surrendering" means to give up which is shown in Vieweg, further the concept of re-using the information is not currently claimed and thus not required. The Examiner asserts that the references read over the claims as currently written and therefore the rejections are maintained.

19. In response to the applicant's argument that, "the service keys used by Vieweg are in no way an "identification number" (which Applicants have disclosed as including such things as a telephone number or telematics unit ID number). Vieweg's keys are disclosed as being used for purposes of encryption, nothing more," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since these keys are tied to a subscription the keys identify the subscription and when the subscription expires a new key would have to be acquired before the service can be enabled thus they identify the subscription and allow the service to be utilized, thus they are not simply used for encryption and nothing more. The Examiner asserts that the references read over the claims as currently written and therefore the rejections are maintained.

20. All rejections made towards the dependent claims are maintained due to the lack of a reply by the applicant in regards to distinctly and specifically pointing out the supposed errors in the Examiner's action in the prior Office Action (37 CFR 1.111). The Examiner asserts that the applicant only argues that the dependent claims should be allowable because the independent claims are unobvious and unpatentable over Vieweg, in view of Messina and where applicable in view of Ikeda.

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL R. FISHER whose telephone number is (571)270-5097. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon/Fri [8am/4:30pm].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PRF

/Dennis Ruhl/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689